REMARKS

Applicant has carefully considered the matters raised by the Examiner in the outstanding Office Action but remains of the position that patentable subject matter is present. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the Examiner's position based on the amendments to the claims and the following remarks.

Claims 1-3, 5-11, 13, 15-16, 18-19 and 21-23 are pending in the Application. Claims 21-23 are allowed while the other claims have been rejected. Of the rejected claims, claims 1 and 19 are independent claims. Claims 2-3, 5-11, 13, 15-16 and 18 are dependent upon claim 1.

Claims 1 and 19 have been amended herein to limit them to a lens having a surface layer wherein the surface layer minimizes light reflected from the eye side of the lens to the eye.

In conventional eyeglasses, for example, light rays enter the human eye by either passing directly through the lens or by being reflected off the eye side surface (eye side of a set of eyeglasses) of the lens. These reflected light rays can have harmful effects on a human eye.

In order to inhibit these harmful light rays, namely UV rays, from entering the human eye or any optical sensor, a surface layer is provided and serves as a reflection preventing layer. The surface layer is preferably formed on the eye side surface of the lens in order to capture and prevent reflected light rays from entering the eye that have bounced off the eye side surface of the lens. The surface layer can also be formed on the object side surface (outer side of a set of eyeglasses) of the lens in order to capture and prevent light rays from directly passing through the lens and into the eye.

As noted above, Applicant has amended claims 1 and 19 to recite that the base material consists of a lens. Claims 5, 9 and 18 have accordingly been amended as well. Support for these amendments can be found at page 16, paragraph 1.

Claims 1 and 19 have also been amended to more clearly recite the function of the surface layer when it is formed on the image side-entire surface (inner side of a set of eyeglasses) of the lens. Support can be found at page 19, paragraphs 1-3 where it is explained that the surface layer formed on the image side of the lens serves to minimize the amount of light rays reflected from the image side of the lens.

Claims 1-3, 5-11, 13, 15 and 19 had been rejected as being anticipated by Tucker. Claim 19 had been rejected as being anticipated by Belmares. Claims 16 and 18 had been rejected as being unpatentable over Tucker. Claims 21-23 had been indicated as allowable.

Tucker teaches an adhesive layer formed between two lens elements, see column 2, lines 44-46. The two lens elements serve as the base material of Tucker, while the adhesive layer is sandwiched between the two lenses.

Claims 1 and 19 recite an opposite arrangement to Tucker. The base material consists of a lens and the surface layer is formed on either surface of the lens. Respectfully, the arrangement of the single lens and the surface layer of claims 1 and 19 differ from that of Tucker.

Furthermore, it would not be obvious to modify the lens arrangement of Tucker in order to arrive at the present invention. Tucker is concerned with using an absorbing layer to allow a selected range of visible light to transmit directly through the two lenses (column 2, lines 44-54). Tucker does not suggest providing a surface layer on the eye side of the lens in order to

side surface of the lens.

Therefore, the present invention differs from Tucker because claims 1 and 19 state that a surface layer is formed on the image side-entire surface of the lens. Such a placing of the surface layer is not taught or suggested in Tucker.

Belmares teaches a film coating that can increase the level of UV radiation absorption when coated on a lens. The film coating is described as being a "UV absorber" and is capable of absorbing and dissipating ultraviolet energy (column 5, lines 38-45). The Examiner had stated that the surface film coating layer of Belmares inherently has a smaller reflectance than the lens as recited in claim 1.

Respectfully, Belmares makes no mention of a reflectance property of the film coating layer or the lens. Belmares only refers to the absorption and transmittance properties of the coated and uncoated lenses (Figure 1).

The coating layer of Belmares is composed of primarily organic materials (column 5, lines 38-56). In contrast, the surface layer of the present invention is made of substantially inorganic

of Belmares that the surface film coating layer has a smaller reflectance than the lens as recited in claim 1.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that the Application is now in condition for allowance and such action is respectfully requested. Should any extensions of time or fees be necessary in order to maintain this Application in pending condition, appropriate requests are hereby made and authorization is given to debit Account # 02-2275.

Respectfully submitted,

MUSERLIAN, LUCAS AND MERCANTI, LLP

By: Donald C. Lucas

Donald C. Lucas
(Attorney for Applicant(s)
600 Third Avenue
New York, New York 10016
Tel. # (212) 661-8000

DCL/mr

Encl: Return receipt post-card